

# Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary

Application No.

10/762,078

Applicant(s)

HARDEMAN ET AL.

Examiner

L. E. Crane

Art Unit

1623

## All Participants:

(1) L. E. Crane.

(2) Jeffrey Childers.

Status of Application: Response to FAOM filed

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 18 April 2007

Time: \_\_\_\_\_

## Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

## Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

*second paragraph and first paragraph under 112.*

Claims discussed:

*all reamining of record*

Prior art documents discussed:

*None*

## Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet*

## Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicant was quereid concerning the response to the rejection concerning the terms "compuond" and "composition." Examiner suggested that the materials being claimed were chemically linked and therefore where chemically a compound, but because of the heterogeneity of the solid support, could not be a homogenous compound. The term -- heterogenous compound -- was suggested as a possilbe terminology to overcome this impass.